

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action of February 23, 2006, the Examiner indicated that the present application contains four patentably distinct species, namely, the invention shown in Figs. 1-4; the invention shown in Figs. 5-8; the invention shown in Figs. 9-11; and the invention shown in Fig. 12-13. The Examiner has requested that applicant elect one of the species for further prosecution in the present application. In response, applicant provisionally elects the invention of Figs. 1-4, with traverse. It is believed that claims 1-8, 10-16, 18-19 and 21-24 read on the invention of Figs. 1-4. It is noted that claims 1-5, 10-14 and 18-22 read on the invention of Figs. 5-8; claims 1-19 and 21-25 read on the invention of Figs. 9-11; and claims 1-2, 10-13 and 18-20 read on the invention of Figs. 12-13. As such, claims 1-2, 10-12 and 18-19 are generic to all of the embodiments of the present application.


There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions. First, all of the inventions in the application must be independent or distinct as claimed, and second, there would be a serious burden on the Examiner if the restriction was not required. See, MPEP, § 8.03. As hereinafter described, since the claimed species in the present application are intertwined, and not independent, applicant believes that the search and examination of the claims can be made without serious burden to the Examiner. Consequently, applicant traverses the restriction in the present application.

Initially, it is noted that all but four claims in the present application define multiple embodiments of the invention. Clearly, the claimed inventions are not independent. As such, examination of almost all of the claims in the present application would entail a search and an examination of at least two embodiments of the invention provided in the present application. In fact, all of the selected claims, namely, claims 1-8, 10-16, 18-19, and 21-24 not only read on the invention of Figs. 1-4, but on the invention

of Figs. 9-11, as well. Consequently, for reasons of efficiency, application believes that the entire application with claims 1-25 should be examined concurrently. As such, while applicant provisionally has elected the invention of Figs. 1-4, such an election is made with traverse.

A check in the amount of \$60.00 is enclosed for a Petition for a one (1) month extension of time. The applicant believes that there are no other fees associated with this Amendment. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge payment of any other fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1170.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Peter C. Stomma, Registration No. 36,020

Boyle Fredrickson Newholm Stein & Gratz S.C.  
250 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1030  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
Phone: 414.225-9755  
Fax: 414.225.9753  
Attorney Docket No. 282.033